

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-20. By this paper, the Applicants add new claims 21-25 and amend claims 1-3, 7, 10, 15, and 17 to address clerical errors and for clarification of certain features to expedite allowance of the present application. These new claims and amendments do not add any new matter. Upon entry of these amendments, claims 1-25 will be pending in the present application and are believed to be in condition for allowance. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-20 under U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Tran (U.S. Patent No. 6,505,238). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Legal Precedent

Anticipation under section 102 can be found only if a single reference shows exactly what is claimed. *Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner*, 778 F.2d 775, 227 U.S.P.Q. 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985). For a prior art reference to anticipate under section 102, every element of the claimed invention must be identically shown in a single reference. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990). To maintain a proper rejection under section 102, a single reference must teach each and every limitation of the rejected claim. *Atlas Powder v. E.I. du Pont*, 750 F.2d 1569 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Accordingly, the Applicants need only point to a single element not found in the cited reference to demonstrate that the cited reference fails to anticipate the claimed subject matter. The prior art reference also must show the *identical* invention “*in as complete detail as contained in the ... claim*” to support a *prima facie* case of anticipation. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Claim Features Omitted from Cited Reference

The Tran reference fails to teach each and every aspect of amended independent claim 1. For example, the present independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “receiving a request for a session with the networked device from a remote interface” and “*redirecting the request from the networked device to a directory server.*” (Emphasis added). In contrast to the present claim 1, the Tran reference merely teaches allowing a user to access a network environment and login to his personal client terminal from a network server. *See* Tran, col. 8, lines 27-30. Tran does not teach *redirecting* a request from a networked device to a directory server. In fact, the Tran reference explicitly teaches “three main steps,” which do not include *redirecting* a request from a networked device to a directory server. *Id.* at col. 8, lines 32-45. As discussed in the reference, these three main steps include accessing a network server, permitting a user to provide credentials, and fully accessing the user’s personal workstation. *Id.* Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Tran fails to teach each and every aspect of independent claim 1.

The Tran reference also fails to teach each and every aspect of amended independent claim 10. For example, the present independent claim 10 recites, *inter alia*, “the directory server comprises user logins and access rights to the desired device for a plurality of authorized users, wherein the access rights are *different for each of the plurality of authorized users.*” (Emphasis added). In contrast to the present claim 10, the Tran reference merely teaches allowing a *single* user to *fully* access his personal client terminal from a network server. *See* Tran, col. 8, lines 41-45. Tran does not teach access rights for a *plurality of authorized users* regarding a single networked device. Indeed, the Tran reference is merely directed to a method for allowing a *single* user to remotely login to the user’s uniquely configured personal workstation. *Id.* at col. 8, lines 50-53 and col. 5, lines 64-65. Additionally, the Tran reference fails to teach access rights that are *different* for each of a plurality of authorized users, as presently recited in claim 10. Indeed, the Tran reference merely teaches providing *full* access to a user’s workstation.

Id. at col. 8, lines 41-45 and col. 5, lines 40-57. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Tran fails to teach each and every aspect of independent claim 10.

Finally, the Tran reference also fails to teach each and every aspect of amended independent claim 17. For example, the present independent claim 17 recites, *inter alia*, “a resource access control database comprising access rights ... wherein the access rights comprise *a first right for a first user* to setup a control task and *a second right for a second user* to modify the control task.” (Emphasis added). In contrast to the present claim 17, the Tran reference merely teaches allowing a *single* user to *fully* access his personal client terminal from a network server. *See* Tran, col. 8, lines 41-45. Tran does not teach access rights for a *first user* and a *second user* regarding the same computer, much less the same task. Indeed, the Tran reference is merely directed to a method for allowing a *single* user to remotely login to the user’s uniquely configured personal workstation. *Id.* at col. 8, lines 50-53 and col. 5, lines 64-65. Additionally, the Tran reference fails to teach *a first right to setup* a control task and *a second right to modify* the *same control task*, as presently recited in claim 17. Indeed, the Tran reference merely teaches providing *full* access to a user’s workstation. *Id.* at col. 8, lines 41-45 and col. 5, lines 40-57. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Tran fails to teach each and every aspect independent claim 17.

It has been shown by the above discussion that the cited reference does not anticipate independent claims 1, 10, and 17. Further, the cited reference would not have suggested the combination of features recited in the present claims. Thus, independent claims 1, 10, and 17 are not rendered unpatentable by the cited reference under 35 U.S.C. § 103. For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and allow independent claims 1, 10, and 17. Further, Applicants request that the Examiner allow the claims depending from independent claims 1, 10, and 17 based on their respective dependencies and based on unique matter recited in each dependent claim.

New Claims

As set forth above, the Applicants added new claims 21-25. The Applicants believe these claims are patentable over the cited references and in condition for allowance. For example, the references of record do not teach or suggest “granting a *right to control a task* for a remote networked device *based on a user role* for the user login data,” as recited in independent claim 21. Therefore, the Applicants request that the Examiner allow the new claims 21-25.

Serial No. 10/037,684
Amendment and Response to Office Action
Mailed October 20, 2004

Conclusion

The Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims should be in condition for allowance. However, if the Examiner believes certain amendments are necessary to clarify the present claims or if the Examiner wishes to resolve any other issues by way of a telephone conference, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 18, 2005


Tait R. Swanson
Registration No. 48,226
FLETCHER YODER
P.O. Box 692289
Houston, TX 77269-2289
(281) 970-4545

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Department, M/S 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400